

OJCS-1361-73
21 NOV 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, [] Automation Task Force STATSPEC
SUBJECT : Comments on [] Automation Project -- STATSPEC
Phase II Report
REFERENCE : Letter of Transmittal from Chairman,
[] Automation Task Force, dtd 16 Oct.
73, subj.: [] Automation Project -- STATSPEC
Phase II Report

The referenced report has been reviewed by appropriate members of this Office. I hope the attached comments and recommendations are of help to you. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

STATINTL

Deputy Director of Joint Computer Support

Attached: a/s
cc: DD/I Planning Officer

21 November 1973

General

1. Because of the nature of the [] processing and its remote physical location, OJCS agrees with the concept of a dedicated special purpose system. Other Agency components such as OCI and OSR should be interested in this system, since their publication activities are similar.

STATSPEC

2. The hardware costs stated by DDI are much higher than systems either in being or under design that are comparable to the [] requirement. (Comments about specific hardware components follow.)

3. The study was quite specific about hardware and recommended hardware expenditures of almost \$1 million. In general, required software expenditures often equal or exceed that of hardware, yet the study does not size this aspect of the problem. Equally serious, the continuing costs of software maintenance were ignored.

4. OJCS is willing to provide further assistance [] in STATSPEC reviewing a Phase III RFP and in evaluating the responses to that RFP.

Recommendations

1. The Phase III RFP should be concerned only with desired functional specifications and those parameters necessary for sizing. The inclusion of specific hardware configurations and text editing methodology places a constraint on potential bidders as to both the size of the computer system and the philosophy of its use. If a bidder is allowed to bid hardware and software, a less expensive system may result. We realize that when the RFP allows creative solutions, the evaluation process becomes more difficult. For this reason OJCS is prepared to assist in the RFP formulation and in the subsequent evaluation.

2. Finally, because the technology for this type of application is proven, it might be appropriate to ask for a fixed price commitment

from the bidders. In this case, the RFP would have to be much more thorough than is usual, but the preliminary work might save time, effort, and money in the long run.

Specific Comments on the Data Dimensions, Inc. (DDI) Phase II Study

1. Data Dimensions noted that the specific procedures to be used for capitalizing words represents a major decision [redacted] STATSPEC It is major because for whatever method is chosen, there will be a direct relation in cost. It is unfortunate that DDI did not provide a quantitative analysis of these costs and trade-offs. For example, if capitalization indicators were supplied by editors and transcribers, requirements for central processor power and direct access storage are reduced considerably as compared to a fully automated method.

2. The selection of the type of remote terminal to be used by the editors is another major decision [redacted] STATSPEC Again, although DDI noted this, there is no quantitative analysis as to the impact on system costs of the various alternatives. It is not clear why DDI recommended the more expensive "intelligent" terminals.

3. The total requirement for disk storage seems to be overstated. When using the volume parameters of the Phase II study, a 20 million character store for the current day and the three previous days looks adequate.

STATSPEC 4. [redacted] should approve a complete detailed system design and not agree to an approval procedure on a program-by-program basis, as recommended by DDI.

5. The use of uninterrupted power equipment which costs about \$70,000 is not consistent with the conditions of availability imposed on the overall system.